# 1AC

### Framework

#### I value morality.

#### Ascertaining a set of reductive criteria to ground ethics is impossible. We cannot possibly derive ethics, nor can we deny it. These principles are not only authoritative but authority itself.

C.S. Lewis [British novelist, poet, academic, medievalist, literary critic, essayist, lay theologian, and Christian apologist, employed at both Oxford and Cambridge] “the Abolition of Man” 1943. http://www.columbia.edu/cu/augustine/arch/lewis/abolition2.htm

**Until** quite **modern times** **all** teachers and even all men **believed** the universe to be such that certain emotional reactions on our part could be either congruousor incongruous to it—believed, in fact, that **objects** did not merely receive, but **could merit**, our **approval** or disapproval**,** our **reverence or** our **contempt**. The reason why Coleridge agreed with the tourist who called the cataract sublime and disagreed with the one who called it pretty was of course that he believed inanimate nature to be such that certain responses could be more 'just' or 'ordinate' or 'appropriate' to it than others. And he believed (correctly) that the tourists thought the same. The man who called the cataract sublime was not intending simply to describe his own emotions about it: he was also claiming that the object was one which merited those emotions. But for this claim there would be nothing to agree or disagree about. To disagree with This is pretty if those words simply described the lady's feelings, would be absurd: if she had said I feel sick Coleridge would hardly have replied No; I feel quite well. When Shelley, having compared the human sensibility to an Aeolian lyre, goes on to add that it differs from a lyre in having a power of 'internal adjustment' whereby it can 'accommodate its chords to the motions of that which strikes them',9 he is assuming the same belief. 'Can you be righteous', asks Traherne, 'unless you be just in rendering to things their due esteem? All things were made to be yours and you were made to prize them according to their value.'10 St **Augustine** **defines virtue** **as** ordo amoris, **the ordinate** **condition** of the affections **in which every object is accorded that** kind of degree of **love** which is **appropriate to it**.11 **Aristotle says** that the aim of **education is to make[s] the pupil like** and dislike **what [s]he ought**.12 When the age for reflective thought comes, **the pupil** who has been **thus** **trained** in 'ordinate affections' or 'just sentiments' **will** easily **find** **the** first **principles in Ethics**; but **to the corrupt** man **they** **will never be visible** at all and he can make no progress in that science.13 **Plato** before him had **said the same.** The little human animal will not at first have the right responses. It must be trained to feel pleasure, liking, disgust, and hatred at those things which really are pleasant, likeable, disgusting and hateful.14 In the Republic, the well-nurtured youth is one 'who would see most clearly whatever was amiss in ill-made works of man or ill-grown works of nature, and with a just distaste would blame and hate the ugly even from his earliest years and would give delighted praise to beauty, receiving it into his soul and being nourished by it, so that he becomes a man of gentle heart. All this before he is of an age to reason; so that when Reason at length comes to him, then, bred as he has been, he will hold out his hands in welcome and recognize her because of the affinity he bears to her.'15 **In early Hinduism** that **conduct** in men which can be **called good consists in conformity to**, or almost participation in, **the Rta**—that great ritual or pattern of nature and supernature which is **revealed** alike **in** the cosmic order, the **moral virtues**, and the ceremonial of the temple. Righteousness, correctness, order, the Rta, is constantly identified with satya or truth, correspondence to reality. As Plato said that the Good was 'beyond existence' and Wordsworth that through virtue the stars were strong, so the Indian masters say that the gods themselves are born of the Rta and obey it.16 **The Chinese** also **speak** **of** a great thing (the greatest thing) called **the Tao**. It is the **reality beyond** all **predicates**, the abyss that was **before the Creator Himself**. It is Nature, it is the Way, the Road. It is the Way in which the universe goes on, the Way in which things everlastingly emerge, stilly and tranquilly, into space and time. It is also the Way which every man should tread in imitation of that cosmic and supercosmic progression, conforming all activities to that great exemplar.17 'In ritual', say the Analects, 'it is harmony with Nature that is prized.'18 The ancient Jews likewise praise the Law as being 'true'.19 This conception in all its forms, Platonic, Aristotelian, Stoic, Christian, and Oriental alike, I shall henceforth refer to for brevity simply as 'the Tao'. Some of the accounts of it which I have quoted will seem, perhaps, to many of you merely quaint or even magical. But what is **common** **to** them **all is** something we cannot neglect. It is the doctrine of **objective value**, the belief that certain attitudes are really true, and others really false, to the kind of thing the universe is and the kind of things we are. Those who know the Tao can hold that to call children delightful or old men venerable is not simply to record a psychological fact about our own parental or filial emotions at the moment, but to recognize a quality which demands a certain response from us whether we make it or not. I myself do not enjoy the society of small children: because I speak from within the Tao I recognize this as a defect in myself—just as a man may have to recognize that he is tone deaf or colour blind. And because our approvals and disapprovals are thus recognitions of objective value or responses to an objective order, therefore emotional states can be in harmony with reason (when we feel liking for what ought to be approved) or out of harmony with reason (when we perceive that liking is due but cannot feel it). No emotion is, in itself, a judgement; in that sense all emotions and sentiments are alogical. But they can be reasonable or unreasonable as they conform to Reason or fail to conform. The heart never takes the place of the head: but it can, and should, obey it. Over **against this stands the world of The Green Book**. In it the very possibility of a **sentiment being reasonable**—or even unreasonable—**has been excluded** from the outset. It can be reasonable or unreasonable only if it conforms or fails to conform to something else. To say that the cataract is sublime means saying that our emotion of humility is appropriate or ordinate to the reality, and thus to speak of something else besides the emotion; just as to say that a shoe fits is to speak not only of shoes but of feet. But this reference to something beyond the emotion is what Gaius and Titius exclude from every sentence containing a predicate of value. Such statements, for them, refer solely to the emotion. Now the emotion, thus considered by itself, cannot be either in agreement or disagreement with Reason. It is irrational not as a paralogism is irrational, but as a physical event is irrational: it does not rise even to the dignity of error. On this view, the world of facts, without one trace of value, and the world of feelings, without one trace of truth or falsehood, justice or injustice, confront one another, and no rapprochement is possible. Hence the educational problem is wholly different according as you stand within or without the Tao. For those within, the task is to train in the pupil those responses which are in themselves appropriate, whether anyone is making them or not, and in making which the very nature of man consists. Those without, if they are logical, must regard all sentiments as equally non-rational, as mere mists between us and the real objects. As a result, they must either decide to remove all sentiments, as far as possible, from the pupil's mind; or else to encourage some sentiments for reasons that have nothing to do with their intrinsic 'justness' or 'ordinacy'. The latter course involves them in the questionable process of creating in others by 'suggestion' or incantation a mirage which their own reason has successfully dissipated. Perhaps this will become clearer if we take a concrete instance. When a Roman father told his son that it was a sweet and seemly thing to die for his country, he believed what he said. He was communicating to the son an emotion which he himself shared and which he believed to be in accord with the value which his judgement discerned in noble death. He was giving the boy the best he had, giving of his spirit to humanize him as he had given of his body to beget him. But Gaius and Titius cannot believe that in calling such a death sweet and seemly they would be saying 'something important about something'. Their own method of debunking would cry out against them if they attempted to do so. For death is not something to eat and therefore cannot be dulce in the literal sense, and it is unlikely that the real sensations preceding it will be dulce even by analogy. And as for decorum—that is only a word describing how some other people will feel about your death when they happen to think of it, which won't be often, and will certainly do you no good. There are only two courses open to Gaius and Titius. Either they must go the whole way and debunk this sentiment like any other, or must set themselves to work to produce, from outside, a sentiment which they believe to be of no value to the pupil and which may cost him his life, because it is useful to us (the survivors) that our young men should feel it. If they embark on this course the difference between the old and the new education will be an important one. Where the old initiated, the new merely 'conditions'. The old dealt with its pupils as grown birds deal with young birds when they teach them to fly; the new deals with them more as the poultry-keeper deals with young birds— making them thus or thus for purposes of which the birds know nothing. In a word, the old was a kind of propagation—men transmitting manhood to men; the new is merely propaganda. It is to their credit that Gaius and Titius embrace the first alternative. Propaganda is their abomination: not because their own philosophy gives a ground for condemning it (or anything else) but because they are better than their principles. They probably have some vague notion (I will examine it in my next lecture) that valour and good faith and justice could be sufficiently commended to the pupil on what they would call 'rational' or 'biological' or 'modern' grounds, if it should ever become necessary. In the meantime, they leave the matter alone and get on with the business of debunking. But this course, though less inhuman, is not less disastrous than the opposite alternative of cynical propaganda. Let us suppose for a moment that the harder virtues could really be theoretically justified with no appeal to objective value. It still remains true that no justification of virtue will enable a man to be virtuous. Without the aid of trained emotions the intellect is powerless against the animal organism. I had sooner play cards against a man who was quite sceptical about ethics, but bred to believe that 'a gentleman does not cheat', than against an irreproachable moral philosopher who had been brought up among sharpers. In battle it is not syllogisms that will keep the reluctant nerves and muscles to their post in the third hour of the bombardment. The crudest sentimentalism (such as Gaius and Titius would wince at) about a flag or a country or a regiment will be of more use. We were told it all long ago by Plato. As the king governs by his executive, so Reason in man must rule the mere appetites by means of the 'spirited element'.20 The head rules the belly through the chest—the seat, as Alanus tells us, of Magnanimity,21 of emotions organized by trained habit into stable sentiments. The Chest-Magnanimity-Sentiment—these are the indispensable liaison officers between cerebral man and visceral man. It may even be said that it is by this middle element that man is man: for by his intellect he is mere spirit and by his appetite mere animal. The operation of The Green Book and its kind is to produce what may be called Men without Chests. **It is an outrage** that **they** **should** **be** commonly **spoken of as Intellectuals.** This gives them the chance to say that he who attacks them attacks Intelligence. It is not so. **They are not distinguished** from other men **by** any unusual **skill in finding truth** nor any virginal ardour to pursue her. Indeed it would be strange if they were: **a** persevering **devotion to truth, a** nice **sense of intellectual honour, cannot** **be** long **maintained without** the aid of a **sentiment** which Gaius and Titius could debunk as easily as any other. It is not excess of thought but defect of fertile and generous emotion that marks them out. **Their heads are no bigger** than the ordinary**: it is the atrophy of the chest** beneath **that makes them seem so.** And all the time—such is the tragi-comedy of our situation—we continue to clamour for those very qualities we are rendering impossible. You can hardly open a periodical without coming across the statement that what our civilization needs is more 'drive', or dynamism, or self-sacrifice, or 'creativity'. In a sort of ghastly simplicity we remove the organ and demand the function. We make men without chests and expect of them virtue and enterprise. We laugh at honour and are shocked to find traitors in our midst. We castrate and bid the geldings be fruitful. The practical result of education in the spirit of The Green Book must be the destruction of the society which accepts it. But this is not necessarily a refutation of subjectivism about values as a theory. The true doctrine might be a doctrine which if we accept we die. No one who speaks from within the Tao could reject it on that account: 'εν δε φαει και 'δλεσσου. But it has not yet come to that. There are theoretical difficulties in the philosophy of Gaius and Titius **However subjective they** **may be about** some **traditional values**, Gaius and Titius have shown by the very act of writing *The Green Book* that **there must be** some other **values** **about which they are not subjective** at all. They write in order to produce certain states of mind in the rising generation, if not because they think those states of mind intrinsically just or good, yet certainly because they think them to be the means to some state of society which they regard as desirable. It would not be difficult to collect from various passages in *The Green Book* what their ideal is. But we need not. The important point is not the precise nature of their end, but the fact that they have an end at all. They must have, or their book (being purely practical in intention) is written to no purpose. And this end must have real value in their eyes. To abstain from calling it good and to use, instead, such predicates as 'necessary' or 'progressive' or 'efficient' would be a subterfuge. They could be forced by argument to answer the questions 'necessary for what?', 'progressing towards what?', 'effecting what?'; in the last resort they would have to admit that some state of affairs was in their opinion good for its own sake. And this time they could not maintain that 'good' simply described their own emotion about it. For the whole purpose of their book is so to condition theyoung reader that he will share their approval, and this would be either a fool's or a villain's undertaking unless they held that their approval was in some way valid or correct. In actual fact Gaius and Titius will be found to hold, with complete uncritical dogmatism, the whole system of values which happened to be in vogue among moderately educated young men of the professional classes during the period between the two wars.1 Their scepticism about values is on the surface: it is for use on other people's values; about the values current in their own set they are not nearly sceptical enough. And this phenomenon is very usual. A great many of those who 'debunk' traditional or (as they would say) 'sentimental' values have in the background values of their own which they believe to be immune from the debunking process. They claim to be cutting away the parasitic growth of emotion, religious sanction, and inherited taboos, in order that 'real' or 'basic' values may emerge. I will now try to find out what happens if this is seriously attempted. Let us continue to use the previous example—that of death for a good cause—not, of course, because virtue is the only value or martyrdom the only virtue, but because this is the *experimentum crucis* which shows different systems of thought in the clearest light. Let us suppose that an Innovator in values regards *dulce et decorum* and *greater love hath no man* as mere irrational sentiments which are to be stripped off in order that we may get down to the 'realistic' or 'basic' ground of this value. Where will he find such a ground? First of all, he might say that the real value lay in the utility of such sacrifice to the community. 'Good', he might say, *'means* what is useful to the community.' But of course the death of the community is not useful to the community—only the death of some of its members. What is really meant is that the death of some men is useful to other men. That is very true. But on what ground are some men being asked to die for the benefit of others? Every appeal to pride, honour, shame, or love is excluded by hypothesis. To use these would be to return to sentiment and the Innovator's task is, having cut all that away, to explain to men, in terms of pure reasoning, why they will be well advised to die that others may live. He may say 'Unless some of us *risk* death all of us are *certain* to die.' But that will be true only in a limited number of cases; and even when it is true it provokes the very reasonable counter question 'Why should I be one of those who take the risk?' At this point the Innovator may ask why, after all, selfishness should be more 'rational' or 'intelligent' than altruism. The question is welcome. If by Reason we mean the process actually employed by Gaius and Titius when engaged in debunking (that is, the connecting by inference of propositions, ultimately derived from sense data, with further propositions), then the answer must be that a refusal to sacrifice oneself is no more rational than a consent to do so. And no less rational. Neither choice is rational—or irrational—at all. **From** propositions about **fact** alone **no *practical* conclusion** **can** ever **be drawn.** *This will preserve society* cannot lead to *do this* except by the mediation of *society ought to be preserved. This will cost you your life* cannot lead directly to *do not do this:* it can lead to it only through a felt desire or an acknowledged duty of self-preservation. **The Innovator is trying to get** **a[n]** conclusion in the **imperative** mood **out of** premisses in **the indicative** mood: **and** though he continues trying to all eternity he **cannot** succeed, for the thing is impossible. **We must** therefore either **extend the word Reason to include** what our ancestors called **Practical Reason** **and confess that judgements** such as *society ought to be preserved* (though they can support themselves by no reason of the sort that Gaius and Titius demand) **are** not mere sentiments but are **rationality itself**; or else we must give up at once, and for ever, the attempt to find a core of 'rational' value behind all the sentiments we have debunked. The Innovator will not take the first alternative, for practical principles known to all men by Reason are simply the *Tao* which he has set out to supersede. He is more likely to give up the quest for a 'rational' core and to hunt for some other ground even more 'basic' and 'realistic'. This he will probably feel that he has found in Instinct. The preservation of society, and of the species itself, are ends that do not hang on the precarious thread of Reason: they are [Is] given by Instinct. That is why there is no need to argue against the man who does not acknowledge them. We have an instinctive urge to preserve our own species. That is why men ought to work for posterity. We have no instinctive urge to keep promises or to respect individual life: that is why scruples of justice and humanity—in fact the *Tao*—can be properly swept away when they conflict with our real end, the preservation of the species. That, again, is why the modern situation permits and demands a new sexual morality: the old taboos served some real purpose in helping to preserve the species, but contraceptives have modified this and we can now abandon many of the taboos. For of course sexual desire, being instinctive, is to be gratified whenever it does not conflict with the preservation of the species. It looks, in fact, as if an ethics based on instinct will give the Innovator all he wants and nothing that he does not want. In reality we have not advanced one step. I will not insist on the point that Instinct is a name for we know not what (to say that migratory birds find their way by instinct is only to say that we do not know how migratory birds find their way), for I think it is here being used in a fairly definite sense, to mean an unreflective or spontaneous impulse widely felt by the members of a given species. In what way does Instinct, thus conceived, help us to find 'real' values? Is it maintained that we *must* obey Instinct, that we cannot do otherwise? But if so, why are *Green Books* and the like written? Why this stream of exhortation to drive us where we cannot help going? Why such praise for those who have submitted to the inevitable? Or is it maintained that if we do obey Instinct we shall be happy and satisfied? But the very question we are considering was that of facing death which (so far as the Innovator knows) cuts off every possible satisfaction: and if we have an instinctive desire for the good of posterity then this desire, by the very nature of the case, can never be satisfied, since its aim is achieved, if at all, when we are dead. It looks very much as if the Innovator would have to say not that we must obey Instinct, nor that it will satisfy us to do so, but that we *ought* to obey it.2 But why ought we to obey Instinct? Is there another instinct of a higher order directing us to do so, and a third of a still higher order directing us to obey *it*?—an infinite regress of instincts? This is presumably impossible, but nothing else will serve. From the statement about psychological fact 'I have an impulse to do so and so' we cannot by any ingenuity derive the practical principle 'I ought to obey this impulse'. Even if it were true that men had a spontaneous, unreflective impulse to sacrifice their own lives for the preservation of their fellows, it remains a quite separate question whether this is an impulse they should control or one they should indulge. For even the Innovator admits that many impulses (those which conflict with the preservation of the species) have to be controlled. And this admission surely introduces us to a yet more fundamental difficulty. Telling us to obey Instinct is like telling us to obey 'people'. People say different things: so do instincts. Our instincts are at war. If it is held that the instinct for preserving the species should always be obeyed at the expense of other instincts, whence do we derive this rule of precedence? To listen to that instinct speaking in its own cause and deciding it in its own favour would be rather simple-minded. Each instinct, if you listen to it, will claim to be gratified at the expense of all the rest. By the very act of listening to one rather than to others we have already prejudged the case. If we did not bring to the examination of our instincts a knowledge of their comparative dignity we could never learn it from them. And that knowledge cannot itself be instinctive: the judge cannot be one of the parties judged; or, if he is, the decision is worthless and there is no ground for placing the preservation of the species above self-preservation or sexual appetite. The idea that, without appealing to any court higher than the instincts themselves, we can yet find grounds for preferring one instinct above its fellows dies very hard. **We grasp at useless words:** we call it the **'basic'**, or 'fundamental', or 'primal', **or 'deepest'** instinct. It is of no avail. Either these words conceal a value judgement passed *upon* the instinct and therefore not derivable *from* it, or else they merely record its felt intensity, the frequency of its operation and its wide distribution. If the former, the whole attempt to base value upon instinct has been abandoned: if the latter, these observations about the quantitative aspects of a psychological event lead to no practical conclusion. It is the old dilemma. **Either the premisses already concealed an imperative or the conclusion remains merely** in the **indicative**.3 Finally, it is worth inquiry whether there *is* any instinct to care for posterity or preserve the species. I do not discover it in myself: and yet I am a man rather prone to think of remote futurity—a man who can read Mr Olaf Stapledon with delight. Much less do I find it easy to believe that the majority of people who have sat opposite me in buses or stood with me in queues feel an unreflective impulse to do anything at all about the species, or posterity. Only people educated in a particular way have ever had the idea 'posterity' before their minds at all. It is difficult to assign to instinct our attitude towards an object which exists only for reflective men. What we have by nature is an impulse to preserve our own children and grandchildren; an impulse which grows progressively feebler as the imagination looks forward and finally dies out in the 'deserts of vast futurity'. No parents who were guided by this instinct would dream for a moment of setting up the claims of their hypothetical descendants against those of the baby actually crowing and kicking in the room. Those of us who accept the *Tao* may, perhaps, say that they ought to do so: but that is not open to those who treat instinct as the source of value. As we pass from mother love to rational planning for the future we are passing away from the realm of instinct into that of choice and reflection: and if instinct is the source of value, planning for the future ought to be less respectable and less obligatory than the baby language and cuddling of the fondest mother or the most fatuous nursery anecdotes of a doting father. If we are to base ourselves upon instinct, these things are the substance, and care for posterity the shadow—the huge, flickering shadow of the nursery happiness cast upon the screen of the unknown future. I do not say this projection is a bad thing: but then I do not believe that instinct is the ground of value judgements. What is absurd is to claim that your care for posterity finds its justification in instinct and then flout at every turn the only instinct on which it could be supposed to rest, tearing the child almost from the breast to creche and kindergarten in the interests of progress and the coming race. The truth finally becomes apparent that neither in any operation with factual propositions nor in any appeal to instinct can the Innovator find the basis for a system of values. None of the principles he requires are to be found there: but they are all to be found somewhere else. 'All within the four seas are his brothers' (xii. 5) says Confucius of the *Chün-tzu,* the *cuor gentil* or gentleman. *Humani nihil a me alienum puto* says the Stoic. 'Do as you would be done by,' says Jesus. 'Humanity is to be preserved,' says Locke.4 **All the practical principles** behind the Innovator's case for posterity, or society, or the species, **are** there **from time immemorial in the *Tao.*** **But** they are **nowhere else**. **Unless you accept these** without question **as** being **to** the world of **action** **what axioms are to** the world of **theory**, **you can have no** practical **principles** whatever. **You cannot reach them as conclusions: they are premisses.** You may, since they can give no 'reason' for themselves of a kind to silence Gaius and Titius, regard them as sentiments: but then you must give up contrasting 'real' or 'rational' value with sentimental value. All value will be sentimental; and you must confess (on pain of abandoning every value) that all sentiment is not 'merely' subjective. You may, on the other hand, regard them as rational—nay as rationality itself—as things so obviously reasonable that they neither demand nor admit proof. But then **you must allow that Reason can be practical, that an *ought* must not be dismissed because** **it cannot** **produce** **some *is* as its credential**. If nothing is self-evident, nothing can be proved. Similarly **if nothing is obligatory for its own sake, nothing is obligatory at all.** To some it will appear that I have merely restored under another name what they always meant by basic or fundamental instinct. But much more than a choice of words is involved. The Innovator attacks traditional values (the *Tao)* in defence of what he at first supposes to be (in some special sense) 'rational' or 'biological' values. But as we have seen, all the values which he uses in attacking the *Tao,* and even claims to be substituting for it, are themselves derived from the *Tao.* If he had really started from scratch, from right outside the human tradition of value, no jugglery could have advanced him an inch towards the conception that a man should die for the community or work for posterity. If the *Tao* falls, all his own conceptions of value fall with it. Not one of them can claim any authority other than that of the *Tao.* Only by such shreds of the *Tao* as he has inherited is he enabled even to attack it. The question therefore arises what title he has to select bits of it for acceptance and to reject others. For if the bits he rejects have no authority, neither have those he retains: if what he retains is valid, what he rejects is equally valid too. The Innovator, for example, rates high the claims of posterity. He cannot get any valid claim for posterity out of instinct or (in the modern sense) reason. He is really deriving our duty to posterity from the *Tao;* our duty to do good to all men is an axiom of Practical Reason, and our duty to do good to our descendants is a clear deduction from it. But then, in every form of the *Tao* which has come down to us, side by side with the duty to children and descendants lies the duty to parents and ancestors. By what right do we reject one and accept the other? Again, the Innovator may place economic value first. To get people fed and clothed is the great end, and in pursuit of its scruples about justice and good faith may be set aside. The *Tao* of course agrees with him about the importance of getting the people fed and clothed. Unless the Innovator were himself using the *Tao* he could never have learned of such a duty. But side by side with it in the *Tao* lie those duties of justice and good faith which he is ready to debunk. What is his warrant? He may be a Jingoist, a Racialist, an extreme nationalist, who maintains that the advancement of his own people is the object to which all else ought to yield. But no kind of factual observation and no appeal to instinct will give him a ground for this option. Once more, he is in fact deriving it from the *Tao:* a duty to our own kin, because they are our own kin, is a part of traditional morality. But side by side with it in the *Tao,* and limiting it, lie the inflexible demands of justice, and the rule that, in the long run, all men are our brothers. Whence comes the Innovator's authority to pick and choose? Since I can see no answer to these questions, I draw the following conclusions. This thing which I have called for convenience **the *Tao****,* and which others may call Natural Law **or Traditional Morality** or the First Principles of Practical Reason or the First Platitudes, is not one among a series of possible systems of value. It **is the sole source of all value** judgements. If it is rejected, all value is rejected. If any value is retained, it is retained. The effort to refute it and raise a new system of value in its place is self-contradictory. **There** has never been, and **never will be**, **a** **radically new** judgement of **value** in the history of the world. **What purport to be new systems** or (as they now call them) 'ideologies', all **consist of fragments** from the *Tao* itself, **arbitrarily wrenched from their context** in the whole **and** then **swollen to madness in their isolation,** yet still owing to the *Tao* and to it alone such validity as they possess. If my duty to my parents is a superstition, then so is my duty to posterity. If justice is a superstition, then so is my duty to my country or my race. **If** the pursuit of **scientific knowledge is a real value,** then **so is conjugal fidelity**. The **rebellion** of new ideologies **against the *Tao* is** a **rebellion of** the **branches against the tree: if the[y]** rebels could **succeed they would** find that they had **destroyed themselves.** **The human mind has no more power of inventing a new value than of imagining a new primary colour,** or, indeed, of creating a new sun and a new sky for it to move in.Does this mean, then, that no progress in our perceptions of value can ever take place? That we are bound down for ever to an unchanging code given once for all? And is it, in any event, possible to talk of obeying what I call the *Tao?* If we lump together, as I have done, the traditional moralities of East and West, the Christian, the Pagan, and the Jew, shall we not find many contradictions and some absurdities? I admit all this. Some criticism, some removal of contradictions, even some real development, is required. But there are two very different kinds of criticism. A theorist about language may approach his native tongue, as it were from outside, regarding its genius as a thing that has no claim on him and advocating wholesale alterations of its idiom and spelling in the interests of commercial convenience or scientific accuracy. That is one thing. A great poet, who has 'loved, and been well nurtured in, his mother tongue', may also make great alterations in it, but his changes of the language are made in the spirit of the language itself: he works from within. The language which suffers, has also inspired the changes. That is a different thing—as different as the works of Shakespeare are from Basic English. It is the difference between alteration from within and alteration from without: between the organic and the surgical. In the same way, the *Tao* admits development from within. There is a difference between a real moral advance and a mere innovation. From the Confucian 'Do not do to others what you would not like them to do to you' to the Christian 'Do as you would be done by' is a real advance. The morality of Nietzsche is a mere innovation. The first is an advance because no one who did not admit the validity of the old maxim could see reason for accepting the new one, and anyone who accepted the old would at once recognize the new as an extension of the same principle. If he rejected it, he would have to reject it as a superfluity, something that went too far, not as something simply heterogeneous from his own ideas of value. But the Nietzschean ethic can be accepted only if we are ready to scrap traditional morals as a mere error and then to put ourselves in a position where we can find no ground for any value judgements at all. It is the difference between a man who says to us: 'You like your vegetables moderately fresh; why not grow your own and have them perfectly fresh?' and a man who says, 'Throw away that loaf and try eating bricks and centipedes instead.' Those who understand the spirit of the *Tao* and who have been led by that spirit can modify it in directions which that spirit itself demands. Only they can know what those directions are. The outsider knows nothing about the matter. His attempts at alteration, as we have seen, contradict themselves. So far from being able to harmonize discrepancies in its letter by penetration to its spirit, he merely snatches at some one precept, on which the accidents of time and place happen to have riveted his attention, and then rides it to death—for no reason that he can give. From within the *Tao* itself comes the only authority to modify the *Tao.* This is what Confucius meant when he said 'With those who follow a different Way it is useless to take counsel'.5 This is why Aristotle said that only those who have been well brought up can usefully study ethics: to the corrupted man, the man who stands outside the *Tao,* the very starting point of this science is invisible.6 He may be hostile, but he cannot be critical: he does not know what is being discussed. This is why it was also said 'This people that knoweth not the Law is accursed'7 and 'He that believeth not shall be damned'.8 **An open mind, in questions** that are **not ultimate, is useful.** But **an open mind about the** ultimate **foundations** either **of Theoretical or** of **Practical Reason is [stupid]** idiocy**.** If a man's mind is open on these things, let his mouth at least be shut. He can say nothing to the purpose. **Outside the *Tao* there is no ground for criticizing** either the *Tao* or **anything** else**.** In particular instances it may, no doubt, be a matter of some delicacy to decide where the legitimate internal criticism ends and the fatal external kind begins. But **wherever any precept of** traditional **morality is simply challenged to produce its credentials,** as though the burden of proof lay on it, **we have taken the wrong position. The** legitimate **reformer endeavours to show that the precept** in question **conflicts with some precept** which its defenders allow to be **more fundamental,** or that it does not really embody the judgement of value it professes to embody. **The direct frontal attack 'Why**?'—'What good does it do?'—'Who said so?' **is never permissible;** not because it is harsh or offensive butbecause no values at all can justify themselves on that level. **If you persist** in *that* kind of trial **you will destroy all values, and so destroy the bases of your own criticism** as well as the thing criticized. You must not hold a pistol to the head of the *Tao.* Nor must we postpone obedience to a precept until its credentials have been examined. Only those who are practising the *Tao* will understand it. It is the well-nurtured man, the *cuor gentil,* and he alone, who can recognize Reason when it comes.9 It is Paul, the Pharisee, the man 'perfect as touching the Law' who learns where and how that Law was deficient.10 In order to avoid misunderstanding, I may add that though I myself am a Theist, and indeed a Christian, I am not here attempting any indirect argument for Theism. I am simply arguing that **if we** are to **have values** **at all** **we must accept** the ultimate platitudes of **Practical** **Reason as having absolute validity**: that any attempt, having become sceptical about these, to reintroduce value lower down on some supposedly more 'realistic' basis, is doomed. Whether this position implies a supernatural origin for the *Tao* is a question I am not here concerned with.

#### This outweighs: A] Regress—deductively deriving an ethical theory from nowhere is logically impossible, so there’s only a risk of my framework. B] Their framework answers the wrong question—ethics is a practical activity, and aiming for complete clarity is oversimplification and makes no more sense than attempting to find the perfect method to decide what dish to order at a restaurant. Thus, even if their framework is true, it can’t guide action.

#### In order to assist us, ethics must account for our own epistemic limitations. This is the function of regulative epistemology, which recognizes the plurality of epistemic projects and devotes itself to how we should practically make decisions. This involves determining the best sources for knowledge, i.e. seeking the right way to find the right answer instead of the right answer itself—it is a question of intellectual virtues.

Woods and Roberts ’10 (Intellectual Virtues: An Essay in Regulative Epistemology (Advances in Cognitive Models & Arch). January 4, 2010)

The triviality of standard epistemology’s examples is due in part to the historical preoccupation with skepticism. If one cannot secure so simple a claim as “ I have two hands” or “ The world has existed for quite a while” against the mischief of evil demons and manipulative brain scientists, it makes little sense to worry about how we know difficult truths about the causes of the Second World War or the structure of DNA. Anti-skeptical maneuvers are a strong motif in the history of philosophy: Plato opposes the Sophists, Augustine the academic skeptics, Descartes Montaigne, Reid Hume, and Moore and Wittgenstein set themselves against skepticism inspired by Russell. However dominant anti-skepticism may be historically, some of epistemology’s most productive moments— in Aquinas, Kant, Plantinga— arose because philosophers were willing to set aside skeptical worries and look into what ordinary practitioners of science, religion, politics, and humanistic inquiry were willing to call knowledge. Intellectual virtues of the kind that interest Zagzebski and us seem likely to have relevance to high-end kinds of knowledge like scientific discoveries, the subtle understanding of difficult texts, moral self-knowledge, and knowledge of God, while being marginal to knowing, upon taking a look, that a bird is outside my window, or that what is in front of me is white paper. Given the central place of knowledge and understanding in human life, one would expect epistemology to be one of the most fascinating and enriching fields of philosophy and itself an important part of an education for life. We might expect that any bright university student who got all the way to her junior year without dipping her mind in an epistemology course would have to hang her head in shame of her cultural poverty. But the character and preoccupations of much of the epistemology of the twentieth century disappoint this expectation. We think that the new emphasis on the virtues and their relation to epistemic goods has the potential to put epistemology in its rightful place. And we hope that the present book, whatever its many shortcomings in detail, will suggest the rich ways in which epistemology-—the study of knowledge and related human goods— connects with ethical and political issues, with the practice of science and other forms of inquiry, with religion and spirituality, with appreciation of the arts, and with the enterprise of education.

#### **Continued**

Nicholas Wolterstorff distinguishes two kinds of epistemology, which he calls “analytic” and “regulative” . Analytic epistemology aims to produce theories of knowledge, rationality, warrant, justification, and so forth, and proceeds by attempting to define these terms. The English-speaking epistemology of the twentieth century is chiefly of this kind, and all of the virtue epistemologies of the last twenty-five years have been attempts to turn the intellectual virtues to the purposes of analytic epistemology. Regulative epistemology, which is the kind mostly practiced by Locke and Descartes and others of their period, does not aim to produce a theory of knowledge (though something like classical foundationalism does get produced as a by-product by Locke and Descartes). Instead, it tries to generate guidance for epistemic practice, “ how we ought to conduct our understandings, what we ought to do by way of forming beliefs” (p. xvi). Regulative epistemology is a response to perceived deficiencies in people’s epistemic conduct, and thus is strongly practical and social, rather than just an interesting theoretical challenge for philosophy professors and smart students. This kind of epistemology aims to change the (social) world. According to Wolterstorff, Locke’s regulative epistemology was a response to the social and intellectual crisis created by the breakup of medieval Christendom’s intellectual consensus. As Locke and others saw it, people’s intellectual lives needed to be reformed-— based on reason, rather than tradition or passions— because only thus could disagreements about the most fundamental issues, along with the resulting social conflicts, be resolved. But Locke also saw the need for reformation as perennial and genetically human: “I think there are a great many natural defects in the understanding capable of amendment.” Since “we are all short sighted” , seeing things from our own particular angle and not possessing comprehensive faculties, we need to learn the habit and inclination to consult others whose opinions differ from our own and read outside our discipline.21 In effect, Wolterstorff distinguishes two kinds of regulative epistemology, a rule-oriented kind and a habit-oriented kind (see pp. 152—4). Rule oriented epistemology, exemplified by Descartes’s Discourse on Method and Rules for the Direction of the Mind, provides procedural directions for acquiring knowledge, avoiding error, and conducting oneself rationally.22 By contrast, Locke’s regulative epistemology, as exemplified in Book IV of Ills Essay Concerning Human Understanding and Of the Conduct of the Understanding, aims less at the direct regulation of epistemic conduct than at the description of the habits of mind of the epistemicaily rational person. As Locke comments, Nobody is made anything by hearing of rules, or laying them up in his memory... and you may as well hope to make a good painter or musician, extempore, by a lecture and instruction in the arts of music and painting, as a coherent thinker, or a strict reasoner, by a set of rules, showing him wherein right reasoning consists. (Conduct, §4, p. 175) We need not rule-books, but a training that nurtures people in the right intellectual dispositions. Wolterstorff emphasizes that Locke focuses not on the belief-producing mechanisms or faculties that are native to the human mind, but instead on the ways in which such natural faculties are employed in more complex intellectual practices, which have a social dimension and are culturally shaped. Locke aims to reform that culture, to reshape the practices, and thus to foster in his contemporaries habits that support the reshaped practices. It is implicit in Locke’s discussions, and often explicit as well, that the habits in question are not mere habits, but virtues. Many habits are nothing more than skills— expertise in plying methods and techniques— but the habits that Locke describes are in many cases “ habits of the heart” , determinate dispositional states of concern, desire, and pleasure and pain, rather than mere habituated aptitudes. We will return to Locke when we take up the topic of intellectual practices in Chapter 5 The virtues epistemology of this book is a return to this tradition of the seventeenth century, to a regulative epistemology which, like Locke’s, describes the personal dispositions of the agent rather than providing direct rules o f epistemic action. It focuses on forming the practitioner’s character and is strongly education-oriented. The stress on intellectual virtues that has arisen among us is a start that can be felicitously developed in the regulative direction. Like Locke’s, our book is a response to a perception of deficiency in the epistemic agents of our time. But it is not a response to any particular historical upheaval or social crisis. We see a perennial set of deficiencies which in every generation need to be corrected, and a perennial positive need for formation in dispositions o f intellectual excellence. Our response to pluralism of belief systems differs from that of Locke and his fellow promoters of the life of “ reason” . Our regulative epistemology does not aim at quieting fundamental disagreement. Virtues presuppose one or another particular metaphysical or world-view background, and the prospect of securing universal agreement about that is dim. However, several of the virtues that we will discuss in Part II broaden minds and civilize intellectual exchange. The formation of excellent intellectual agents is clearly the business of schools and parents. They are the chief educators of character. But Locke and Descartes think that philosophers have a role as well, and we agree. What is that role, and how does it work? How do philosophers contribute to the regulation of intellectual character? The role that we picture for ourselves both resembles and diverges from the one that epistemologists in the twentieth century implicitly accepted for themselves.

#### Impacts: A] Probability—if some have a greater capacity to achieve moral knowledge than others, my framework always maximizes the chance of getting the right answer. B] Takes out all skeptical argument—epistemological pursuit can only start when we set aside trivial skeptical concerns. C] Proves we can weigh by comparing habits of the mind to determine what constitutes effective testimony.

#### Thus, any educational activity should pursue intellectual virtues. Virtues, such as humility, require one to recognize cognitive limitations and epistemic authority of experts. We need to learn what authorities to trust, not to move away from trust in authorities.

Woods and Roberts ’10 (Intellectual Virtues: An Essay in Regulative Epistemology (Advances in Cognitive Models & Arch). January 4, 2010)

Thomas Reid pointed out that we humans tend to believe what we’re told. He considered this tendency “a good gift of Nature”, and the goodness he had in mind was in the first instance epistemic. Because the intellectual life is profoundly cooperative, this gift is important to us. It is a faculty, not something to suppress, eradicate, or bypass, but something to refine and develop, because we depend, and must depend, heavily on the unsupported testimony of others. Without this natural tendency, children could not get started in their cognitive lives, nor could adults come close to collecting all the truths they need to function well intellectually.

#### They continue

The threat posed by an undisciplined credulity disposition is gullibility, but in some intellectual ambiences a wholesale fastidiousness about belief formation may be the problem. Plantinga’s discussion of testimony is less polemical than his discussion of self-knowledge, but it might have been directed against a tendency suggested by some of the writings of Descartes, Locke, and Kant. These epistemologists are suspicious of testimony because it seems to compromise the principle that each person should be responsible for his own cognitions and because testimony may seem to be a generally low-grade kind of evidence. But, given natural human limitations, and the way things go according to the human cognitive design plan, the early modern tendency to prescribe a general suspicion of tradition and testimony could be read as an endorsement of epistemic arrogance and fastidiousness an insistence on the right and duty always to “see for oneself” . A character that made us generally suspicious of testimony or overly insistent on having in our own possession all the evidence supporting each of our beliefs, would be a paralyzing intellectual paranoia, a hyperindividualism that would be both unrealistic and, to the extent that it actually got instantiated as a personality trait, detrimental to our cognitive functioning. The virtues of intellectual humility and gratitude could be regarded as a liberation of the credulity disposition from unwarranted intellectual suspicion and distrust, and thus as dispositions promoting warrant in testimony circumstances.

#### Impacts: A] Learning who to trust is a crucial educational function of debate, irrespective of the truth of my framework. B] My framework is key to developing personal virtues of epistemic humility which is necessary for moral life. C] Arguments about how it’s hard to determine who to trust are non-unique since we have to determine that we ought to trust ourselves when we don’t use testimony.

#### The standard is appealing to qualified moral authorities. To clarify: A] The framework doesn’t argue that the content of moral rules is that we should follow testimony, but rather that it’s a heuristic for obtaining moral knowledge. That means neg standards that prove the truth of the ethical theory aren’t competitive—if your framework is correct, a qualified moral testimony will have already considered it. B] Testimony is inescapable—any epistemic starting point would be impossible without some deference to others. We could not even debate without trusting our authors aren’t lying or believing our round is where tabroom says it is. That means objections must prove some distinction that means moral testimony is uniquely bad.

#### Weighing appeals to intuitions – ignore calc indicts – intuitions are inescapable.

Huemer (http://spot.colorado.edu/~huemer/5.htm)

Other things being equal, it is reasonable to assume that things are the way they appear. I call this principle 'Phenomenal Conservatism' ('phenomenal' meaning 'pertaining to appearances'). I have discussed the principle elsewhere, so here I will be relatively brief.(1) There is a type of mental state, which I call an 'appearance', that we avow when we say such things as 'It seems to me that p', 'It appears that p', or 'p is obvious', where p is some proposition. Appearances have propositional contents--things they represent to be the case--but they are not beliefs, as can be seen from the intelligibility of, 'The arch seems to be taller than it is wide, but I don't think it is'. Nevertheless, appearances normally lead us to form beliefs. 'Appearance' is a broad category that includes mental states involved in perception, memory, introspection, and intellection. Thus, we can say, 'This line seems longer than that one', 'I seem to recall reading something about that', 'It seems to me that I have a headache', and 'It seems that any two points can be joined by a single straight line'.(2) All of those statements make sense, using the same sense of 'seems'. Appearances can be deceiving, and appearances can conflict with one another, as in the Müller-Lyer illusion: It initially seems that the top line is longer than the bottom line. But if you get out a ruler and measure them, you will find them to be of the same length. The top line will seem, when holding a ruler next to it, to be 2 inches long, and the bottom line will similarly appear to be 2 inches long. So, all things considered, it seems that the two lines are of the same length. As this example illustrates, an initial appearance can be overruled by other appearances (this does not mean the initial appearance goes away, but only that we don't believe it), and only by other appearances. Some appearances are stronger than others--as we say, some things are 'more obvious' than others--and this determines what we hold on to and what we reject in case of conflict. Presumably, it more clearly seems to you that the result of measuring the lines is accurate than that the result of eyeballing them is, so you believe the measurement result (this may have to do with background beliefs you have about the reliability of different procedures--which would themselves be based upon the way other things seem to you). Things can become complicated when many different beliefs and/or appearances are involved, but the basic principle is that we are more inclined to accept what more strongly seems to us to be true. Appearances can be intellectual, as opposed to sensory, mnemonic, or introspective. It seems to us that the shortest path between any two points must be a straight line; that time is one-dimensional and totally ordered (for any two moments in time, one is earlier than the other); and that no object can be completely red and completely blue at the same time. I accept those things on intellectual grounds. I am not looking at all the possible pairs of points and all the possible paths connecting each pair and seeing, with my eyes, that the straight path is the shortest in each case. Instead, I am 'seeing' intellectually that it must be true--that is, when I think about it, it becomes obvious. Logical judgments rest on intellectual appearances. We think the following inference logically valid (the premises entail the conclusion, regardless of whether the premises are true): Socrates is a man. All men are inconsiderate. Therefore, Socrates is inconsiderate. but the next one invalid: Socrates is inconsiderate. All men are inconsiderate. Therefore, Socrates is a platypus. We 'see' this, not with our eyes, but with our intellect or reason. All judgments are based upon how things seem to the judging subject: a rational person believes only what seems to him to be true, though he need not believe everything that seems true.(3) The function of arguments is to change the way things seem to one's audience, by presenting other propositions (premises) that seem true and seem to support something (the conclusion) that may not initially have seemed true to the audience. An argument has force only to the extent that its premises seem true and seem to support its conclusion. Intellectual inquiry presupposes Phenomenal Conservatism, in the sense that such inquiry proceeds by assuming things are the way they appear, until evidence (itself drawn from appearances) arises to cast doubt on this. Even the arguments of a philosophical skeptic who says we aren't justified in believing anything rest upon the skeptic's own beliefs, which are based upon what seems to the skeptic to be true.

#### 2] Rule-based ethics fail—future applications are indeterminate.

McGinnis ’06 (Nicholas McGinnis 6 PhD, successfully defended his dissertation, On Philosophical Intuitions, at the University of Western Ontario in the Spring of 2015 under the supervision of Dr. Robert Stainton. He was born in Montreal, Canada and attended Concordia University where he completed both his B.A. (honours) and M.A. in philosophy. He is a member of the Rotman Institute of Science and Values. His work focuses on philosophy of language, experimental philosophy, metaphysics, and non-classical logic, “Wittgenstein's Influence on the Development of Virtue Ethics”, A Thesis In The Department of Philosophy Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in Philosophy at Concordia University Montreal, Quebec, Canada, August 2006) OS

McDowell begins with Wittgenstein's example at §185 of PI (though, for Wittgenstein, this was a return to a similar thought-experiment at §143), where a pupil is asked to extend a series (through an order which has the form +n, in this case +2), so as to produce 2, 4, 6, 8, etc. McDowell comments that we have a tendency to view iterations of this task as a type of psychological mechanism, analogous to the movement of some otherwise inert physical object being guided by an underlying structure—the common metaphor is that of rails—necessarily towards the correct answer (McDowell 1998: 58).34 This view is, McDowell notes, rather suspect. The first problem is that any rule-following behaviour or statement of understanding a rule ("I am doing this")— such as that of adding 2—is in a sense underdetermined: the potential behaviour that comes under the jurisdiction of rule is infinite (in this case we have the set of natural numbers) while at any given time we've seen, or followed ourselves, only a finite fraction of these possible cases. What evidence we have for the picture of rule-following as a set of 'rails' cannot dismiss the possibility that in the future behaviour will "diverge from what we could count as correct" (ibid., 59). Wittgenstein's example of this, also used by McDowell, is a person who continues the +2 series after reaching 1000 thusly: 1004, 1008, 1012... and does not understand that he has made a mistake, believing that he was applying the rule correctly. At this point, as Wittgenstein notes, it is no use to merely say: "But can't you see?" (cf. PI §185)—for he sees differently: a rabbit instead of a duck, as with the old optical illusion. Perhaps he believed that to correctly apply the rule, he was to "add 2 up to 1000, 4 up to 2000, 6 up to 3000, and so on", and does not admit or understand that there was a mistake (ibid., 59). The constant possibility of such behaviour runs against the supposition that to follow a rule is to be guided by these inexorable 'rails'. Concludes McDowell: "The pictured state, then, always transcends the grounds on which it is allegedly postulated" (ibid., 59). The point of these considerations is not a sceptical one, as is sometimes argued, nor to undermine confidence in our speech acts; rather it is only to remove an illusory ground we sometimes ascribe to meaning, a picture in which "the steps are really already taken, even before I take them in writing or orally or in thought" (ibid., 59). The connection between the objection sketched by McDowell earlier on and Wittgenstein's argument is clear. The 'major premise', formulated as a single universal principle, is meant to anticipate all cases of application, "as only the act of meaning can anticipate reality" (PI §188). It is precisely because of this attributed ability that it can serve as major premise, much like an algebraic formula is thought to be able to. The minor premise of the syllogism consists of the specific integers in play, which leads us, so the picture goes, necessarily to a specific conclusion, determined by the formula. Likewise, a "complete specification of the reason why the virtuous person acts as he does" is required as major premise, as mere perceptual sensitivity is insufficient to provide reasons for action (ibid., 54); recall McDowell's formulation of the objection— that both the virtuous and non-virtuous may share the same perception but fail to act in corresponding ways, showing virtue forms a composite state. The 'deliverances of sensitivity' (the 'integers'), to use McDowell's phrase, interact with something else—the universal principle and one's own volition (the 'formula'), to produce determinate answers. But this conception strikes McDowell as 'implausible', for cases would inevitably turn up in which a mechanical application of the rules would strike one as wrong—and not necessarily because one had changed one's mind; rather, one's mind on the matter was not susceptible of capture in any universal formula (ibid., 58). Wittgenstein's rule-following 'argument'—I use the term with some trepidation, for it would be somewhat of a mischaracterization to see it as a pure example of premise / conclusion philosophical dialectic—serves to dispel the notion that to act rationally is to follow the dictates of some externally-determined universal formula, and also the correlated notion that error consists in something analogous to mechanical breakdown. Consider the algebraic example. Are the steps to be taken for a series in some way 'determined'? For Wittgenstein, such a statement is perhaps referring to the fact that people are brought by their education (training) so to use the formula y = x², that they all work out the same value for y when they substitute the same number for x. [...] It may now be said: "The way the formula is meant determines which steps are taken." What is the criterion for the way the formula is meant? It is, for example, the kind of way we always use it, the way we are taught to use it. (PI §189; §190). When someone's behaviour diverges from what we would think counts as the correct answer in a given series, and does not 'see' the mistake at all, we lose the picture of rules as determining meaning in all possible application and cases. Grasping meaning is instead a function of being taught proper application of symbols. Yet for all this we do not lose confidence in our assertions or practices. Instead we see that it is largely spurious to make certain sorts of particularly stringent epistemological demands: that understanding a rule consists in letting one's mind be guided by some objectively present, mind-independent structure (such as Platonism concerning mathematics). McDowell's stressing of Wittgensteinian 'uncodifiability' connects with several of the critical aspects of virtue ethics explored in the last chapter. The point of the 'rulefollowing' argument was that what counts as rational or consistent behaviour is not wholly determined by external facts which the mind somehow grasps via abstract contemplation; this is the vanity of previous moral theories which most authors of virtue ethics attack, though they focus on different targets, after different fashions. Anscombe's criticism of Kant, recall, explicitly made use of uncodifiability: "no theoretically adequate provision can be made for exceptional circumstances," she writes, rendering it impossible to construct the appropriate type of stipulation necessary to govern descriptions of actions (Anscombe 1999: 27; 29). This is akin to McDowell's presentation of Wittgenstein; in both, there lurks the realization that concept-application is not governed by the picture of 'rails'. The relevant description of, say, a lie—Anscombe's example35 — is not something which can be adequately captured in what McDowell terms a 'universal formula', for considerations identical to those of the +2 series, as are the consequences. Speaking of the objection's equal application to utilitarianism: "any action can be so described as to make it fall under a variety of principles of utility (as I shall say for short) if it fall under any" (ibid., 28). The general nature of the problem under Anscombe's consideration here is so similar to Wittgenstein it even seems strange she would not quote him or bring the connection out. Perhaps the connection was taken to be entirely self-evident. Another link between the rule-following argument and the critiques of virtue ethics is the argument that 'pleasure', or any other good, is a heterogeneous, polycentric concept (an argument we presented through Nussbaum's writings on the topic). The opposite view is that of pleasure as a unitary and measurable object; but as the rule-following argument applies across the board, it is clear that what counts as pleasure can no more be determined from 'outside' than what counts as a lie, or what counts as following the +2 rule. The attraction to a certain species of moral theory lies precisely in the claim that we can define what 'pleasure' is, or 'lies' are, in a peculiarly binding and inexorable way, so as to 'solve' problems with no rational dissent possible from the one answer determined by the formula. If we find Wittgenstein's rule-following argument convincing, however, we should not view such projects as likely to succeed: for it seems rather unlikely, if not downright impossible, that the definitions upon which the projects ride will be found— that they are indeed such things as can be 'found'. Yet despite these rather difficult conclusions there is no reason to embrace scepticism or lose confidence in the grounds of our assertions. Where does our confidence come from, if not from determinate rules and principles, lying outside of us, as it were? According to McDowell—approvingly quoting Stanley Cavell—nothing but our 'shared forms of life', a 'whirl of organism' that consists of common discursive practices, 'routes of interest' and patterns of recognized similarity: a 'congruence of subjectivities' (McDowell 1998: 60-61). We may choose to explain the correct extension of a number series in syllogistic terms, but this should not lead us to the conclusion that the operation moves independently of our forms of life. Writes Wittgenstein about the tendency towards this sort of conclusion, "It is as if we could grasp the whole use of the word in a flash." Like what e.g.? ... But have you a model for this? No. It is just that this expression suggests itself to us. As the result of the crossing of different pictures [...] You have no model of this superlative fact, but you are seduced into using a super-expression. (PI §193). This 'flash' of insight is the seductive illusion that we mount ourselves on some external rails when we grasp the use of a rule, such as 'add 2', because we have the sensation that, despite the underdetermined nature of the picture, we see application of algebra or words into infinity. This 'strange' sensation leads us to postulate the superlative picture. Writes Wittgenstein, But there is nothing astonishing, nothing queer, about what happens. It becomes queer when we are led to think that the future development must in some way already be present in the act of grasping the use and yet isn't present. [...] Where is the connexion effected between the sense of the expression 'Let's play a game of chess' and all the rules of the game?—Well, in the list of rules of the game, in the teaching of it, in the day-to-day practice of playing. ( PI §197). The ability to project use into indefinite future context turns therefore not on some mysterious underlying mechanism churning out 'appropriate' answers, but rather on the taught practices of linguistic communities and creative decisions made within them.36 Hence the thought that calculations within the deductive paradigm ought to be 'automatically compelling' somehow above and beyond forms of life is a method of avoiding Wittgenstein's difficult conclusions about the grounds of our rationality. For McDowell, the correct standpoint, or 'cure' to this (no doubt following Wittgenstein's notion of 'therapy'), instead is to give up the idea that philosophical thought, about the sorts of practice in question, should be undertaken at some external standpoint, outside our immersion in our familiar forms of life. (McDowell 1998: 63) This is the path to the Neurathian solution advocated by Hursthouse, as we saw in the last chapter. It may seem at first glance that Hursthouse's use of eudaimonia as a naturalistic ground for her brand of virtue ethics runs counter to the line of argument presented here, in that explicit reference to human flourishing may serve as major premise in a syllogism of the form criticized by McDowell here. But Hursthouse never intends, and indeed explicitly denies, that her naturalism is meant to be convincing outside of an acquired ethical outlook, i.e. a form of life (Hursthouse 1999: 166). Such a move will seem utterly unconvincing without the background assumed by appreciation of the rather deep implications of the rule-following argument, which includes McDowell's 'cure' for the seduction by the deductive paradigm; paradigm which, as McDowell concludes his interpretation of Wittgenstein, is a deeply unsatisfactory model even standing by itself: Pupils do acquire a capacity to go on, without further advice, to novel instances. Impressed by the sparseness of the teaching, we find this remarkable. But assimilation to the deductive paradigm leaves it no less remarkable. The assimilation replaces the question "How is it that the pupil, given that sparse instruction, goes on to new instances in the right away?" with the question "How is it that the pupil, given that sparse instruction, divines from it a universal formula with the right deductive powers?". The second question is, if anything, less tractable. (McDowell 1998: 64) The first question is quite tractable, by contrast. The boundary conditions created by both human nature and shared forms of life provide sufficient explanatory content to explain extension to novel circumstance; whereas it is difficult to see how a pupil can make the 'leap of divination' McDowell views as necessary to answer the second.37 Furthermore, this is not to suggest that there are unbridgeable chasms created by forms of life or that one cannot be brought to 'see' things correctly if they have grasped usage differently. But these are topics to be addressed in the next chapter. For now, I have argued that virtue ethics—of which I chose Hursthouse's version as an exemplar—crucially depends on this interpretation of Wittgenstein's rule-following argument and the consequences drawn from it.

#### Implications: A] Proves reflection is the wrong starting point since deductive derivation fails—the only solution is reliance on practical moral development. B] Terminal defense to their framework since it’s conceptually impossible to apply.

### Contention 1 is MLK

#### Martin Luther King Jr. is a pioneering figure in race relations, winning a Nobel Prize and studying the example of Indian freedom fighters like Gandhi. His work directly led to the passage of the civil rights act. His philosophy on social justice compels him to affirm.

Moshman ’16 (David, Intellectual freedom activist, “Martin Luther King on the First Amendment,” Huff, 1/4, <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/david-moshman/martin-luther-king-on-the_b_8911848.html>) OS

The fall 2015 semester saw two overlapping student movements: one for intellectual and emotional safety and one for racial justice. The movement for safety insisted that colleges should be “safe spaces” where students are protected from “microaggressions” and can count on “trigger warnings” about anything in the curriculum they might find traumatic. The movement for racial justice involved a variety of concerns and goals at colleges and universities across the country. In some cases, overlapping with the safety movement, this included demands for censoring and punishing racist speech. Is free speech antithetical to racial justice? Martin Luther King, Jr. would have been surprised at the suggestion that the pursuit of racial justice requires censorship. On the contrary, he understood as well as anyone that the First Amendment was crucial to the civil rights movement. King spoke passionately in support of the First Amendment on April 3, 1968, the day before his assassination, in what turned out to be his final speech. In Memphis to support a sanitation workers strike, he proclaimed: Something is happening in our world. The masses of people are rising up. And wherever they are assembled today, whether they are in Johannesburg, South Africa; Nairobi, Kenya; Accra, Ghana; New York City; Atlanta, Georgia; Jackson, Mississippi; or Memphis, Tennessee — the cry is always the same: “We want to be free.” This, he continued, was the cry of people “determined to gain our rightful place in God’s world.” And that’s all this whole thing is about. We aren’t engaged in any negative protest and in any negative arguments with anybody. We are saying that we are determined to be men. We are determined to be people. We are saying ... that we are God’s children, we don’t have to live like we are forced to live. But the struggle for freedom and justice faced resistance, including an injunction, and this is where the First Amendment came into play: Now about injunctions: We have an injunction and we’re going into court tomorrow morning to fight this illegal, unconstitutional injunction. All we say to America is, “Be true to what you said on paper.” If I lived in China or even Russia, or any totalitarian country, maybe I could understand some of these illegal injunctions. Maybe I could understand the denial of certain basic First Amendment privileges, because they hadn’t committed themselves to that over there. But somewhere I read of the freedom of assembly. Somewhere I read of the freedom of speech. Somewhere I read of the freedom of press. Somewhere I read that the greatness of America is the right to protest for right. And so just as I say, we aren’t going to let dogs or water hoses turn us around, we aren’t going to let any injunction turn us around. We are going on. The speech moved to other topics, coming finally to its famous conclusion: And then I got into Memphis. And some began to ... talk about the threats that were out. What would happen to me from some of our sick white brothers? Well, I don’t know what will happen now. We’ve got some difficult days ahead. But it really doesn’t matter with me now, because I’ve been to the mountaintop. And I don’t mind. Like anybody, I would like to live a long life. Longevity has its place. But I’m not concerned about that now. I just want to do God’s will. And He’s allowed me to go up to the mountain. And I’ve looked over. And I’ve seen the Promised Land. I may not get there with you. But I want you to know tonight, that we, as a people, will get to the Promised Land! And so I’m happy tonight. I’m not worried about anything. I’m not fearing any man. Mine eyes have seen the glory of the coming of the Lord. King’s vision of the Promised Land included equal rights for all, and those rights included freedoms of belief, speech, press, assembly, and protest. First Amendment rights, in his view, were crucial for reaching this land long promised, and part of what makes it the Promised Land. The Promised Land, then, is not simply a “safe space.” Social justice is not achieved by eliminating “microaggressions” or requiring “trigger warnings.” Student activists, whatever their cause, should recognize and insist on intellectual freedom for all.

### Contention 2 is Obama

#### Barack Obama has unique political experience. He was the first black president of a super racist country, won the Nobel Peace Prize, and pretty much singlehandedly reversed Bush’s destruction. He has extensive legal knowledge and experience with constitutional interpretation. He affirms—college students shouldn’t be shielded.

Byrnes ’15 (The Hill, Jesse, “Obama hits 'coddled' liberal college students,” 9/15, <http://thehill.com/blogs/blog-briefing-room/news/253641-obama-hits-coddled-liberal-college-students>) OS

President Obama is weighing in on the discussion over political dialogue on college campuses, saying students shouldn't be "coddled" from opposing views. "It’s not just sometimes folks who are mad that colleges are too liberal that have a problem. Sometimes there are folks on college campuses who are liberal and maybe even agree with me on a bunch of issues who sometimes aren’t listening to the other side. And that’s a problem, too," Obama said during a town hall on Monday in Des Moines, Iowa. "I've heard of some college campuses where they don’t want to have a guest speaker who is too conservative. Or they don’t want to read a book if it has language that is offensive to African-Americans, or somehow sends a demeaning signal towards women," Obama continued. "I’ve got to tell you, I don’t agree with that either. I don’t agree that you, when you become students at colleges, have to be coddled and protected from different points of views," he said.

# Frontlines

# Substance

## Testimony Weighing

### AT: Whites

Prefer testimonies who are people of color.

Clifton ’14 (10 Simple Ways White People Can Step Up to Fight Everyday Racism Derrick Clifton's avatar image By Derrick Clifton September 04, 2014[mic.com/articles/97900/10-simple-rules-for-being-a-non-racist-white-person#.rAycYy645](http://mic.com/articles/97900/10-simple-rules-for-being-a-non-racist-white-person#.rAycYy645))

By taking the leadership of people of color in the broader conversation about eradicating racism, whitescan take steady, even simple steps towardsbecomingalliesin the fight against racial inequality, not merely bystanders — or worse, perpetrators: 1. Listen when people of color talk about everyday racism and white privilege. Source: AP When a white person speaks up about racism, other whites tend to listen carefully and respectfully, even if they disagree. But more often than not, when blacks and people of color speak about racism, the instinct is to jump to conclusions, to interrupt, call them liars, question their intelligence or walk away from the conversation altogether. Ending such a dialogue because one might feel uncomfortable does little to push the conversation forward, and reinforces white privilege. People of color live with the burden of institutional racism, but there are little-to-no consequences for whites who choose to ignore a historically violent and oppressive system from which they benefit every day. Instead, a more productive solution comes through listening carefully and reserving judgment when people of color openly discuss the pain they have endured. 2. Honor the feelings of people of color in the discussion. It is not about your white guilt. Paula Deen addresses her use of racial slurs during a June 2013 interview on the Today Show.Source: Television Definition via YouTube If white people are tired of hearing people of color "whine" or "rant" about white privilege, then imagine how exhausting and burdensome it is to directly contend with racism every day for years. The last thing people of color need to hear from white people is how they should deal with or talk about encountering racism. Even with the most well-intentioned effort,white peoplemust acknowledge theywill never have the same understandingorrange of experiences that peopleofcolorbring to the conversation. This is not to say that white people can't join the discussion, but that they must focus on a solution. Too often, white people overreact to criticism, become defensive and turn their feeling of uncomfortableness back on their peers. People of color have long been policed for their "tone" or "overemotional attitude," feelings that are human and valid after dealing with something as infuriating as racism. 3. Ask plenty of questions. Earnestly seek to understand people of color before trying to have your viewpoint understood. Source: Brian Kam via YouTube During a heart-to-heart about racism, don't assume that everything being said immediately makes sense. The best way to seek clarity and bridge any gaps of knowledge is to simply ask for more information, just as you would for any other topic that isn't your area of expertise. It's OK to admit that you don't know how it feels to be racially profiled by cops, surrounded by advertisements that reinforce Eurocentric beauty standards or be presumed unintelligent or inferior until proven otherwise — all because of the color of your skin. By being inquisitive, you're more likely to reach a place of understanding and empathy. Once this connection is established, you have a stronger foundation to share your own personal experiences. 4. Educate yourself about racism as much as possible before asking people of color for help. Source: Hillary Commer via YouTube It's important to listen and defer to people of color during discussions about racism, but remember that they, too, are humans with limits on their time, resources, attention spans and emotional reserves. Sometimes, they may not have the energy to educate white people about racism because they've talked about it so much already. It may also trigger pain, resentment and sadness from dealing with oppression. So if a person of color backs away from the conversation and asks for space, respect that. There is no lack of information on the topic. Take responsibility and educate yourself, using the many books, recorded speeches, poems, news articles, research studies and other sources of information publicly available. 5. Challenge other white people in your life to think critically about racism — family, friends, coworkers, teachers and even public officials. Source: AP If you see or hear something, say something. Don't ignore discussions of racism when they emerge in the news cycle or sit by idly while someone perpetuates racial stereotypes or blatant disrespect — even if that disrespect is coming from a close friend, family member or superior. Encourage white people in your life to engage in the same kind of critical thinking that you yourself are engaging in. 6. Direct peers towards the perspectives of people of color. Becoming a "savior" is not cool. Tim Wise speaks at Missouri State University.Source: Missouri State University via YouTube It's crucial not to hog all of the air in the conversation, or act as the spokesperson for people of color —because white people can't truly present the perspectives of people of color. In addition, whiteperspectives andvoices have historically been given priority over thelived experiences andknowledge produced by people of color. Instead, actively affirm the leadership of people of color in the conversation. Consider limiting the amount of personal perspective you offer and refer other white people to the same sources of enlightenment and insight that helped you best understand how to put anti-racism into practice. \

### Obama O/W

#### Obama outweighs:

#### [a] Context experience—he was a constitutional law professor so he better knows which restrictions on CPS are justified.

#### [b] Personal experience—he’s been the personal recipient of hate speech from racists who hated his admin.

### MLK O/W

#### MLK outweighs:

#### [a] Personal experience—he was the recipient of lots of hate speech so he’s in the best position to evaluate it.

#### [b] Leadership—MLK had to show EXTENSIVE moral clarity and had the bravery to stand up for his principles at risk of death.

## AT Testimonies

### AT: Pope

#### [1] No link—your card just says he thinks it’s bad to use hate speech, not that he thinks we should ban it. There’s a difference—it’s good to donate to charity but it’s bad to steal your money and force you.

#### [2] No relevance in context—he’s not from the US, he’s not talking about colleges, and he doesn’t have legal experience.

#### [3] Dogmatism—the Pope is forced to maintain traditional Catholicism and keep all the Bishops happy. He can’t dramatically break from the tradition.

#### [4] The Pope is transphobic—that’s bad testimony.

AP ’16 (Associated Press, LGBTQ Nation, “Pope Francis denounces transgender people as ‘annihilation of man’,” <https://www.lgbtqnation.com/2016/08/pope-francis-denounces-transgender-people-annihilation-man/>) OS

VATICAN CITY (AP) – Pope Francis has lamented that children are being taught at school that gender can be a choice. Francis made his remarks during a private meeting last week with bishops from Poland during his pilgrimage there. The Vatican released a transcript on Tuesday of those closed-door remarks. The pope said he wanted to conclude his remarks by reflecting on this: “We are living a moment of annihilation of man as image of God.” He added that his predecessor, Benedict XVI, had labelled current times “the epoch of sin against God the Creator”.